

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

*S.J., a minor child by and through his parents
S.H.J. and J.J.,*

Plaintiff,

v.

ISSAQUAH SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 411,
et al.,

Defendants.

No. C04-1926RSL

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on "Plaintiff's Motion to Amend (Reconsideration) Order Awarding Attorney's Fees" (Dkt. #84). Motions for reconsideration are disfavored in this district and will be granted only upon a "showing of manifest error in the prior ruling" or "new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1).

In his motion, plaintiff asks the Court to reconsider its "Order Awarding Attorney's Fees" (Dkt. #83) because he contends that the Court did not address his request for attorney's fees relating to the motion to dismiss, subsequent appeal to the Ninth Circuit, and fees incurred preparing the motion for attorney's fees and costs. See Motion at 2. The Order Awarding Attorney's Fees and Costs states: "the Court finds that plaintiff is barred from recovering fees and costs subsequent to the April 8, 2004 offer of settlement because the relief plaintiff finally

ORDER DENYING MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION

1 obtained is not more favorable than the relief offered in the settlement offer.” See Dkt. #83 at 4.
2 Because the fees relating to the motion to dismiss, appeal to the Ninth Circuit, and the motion
3 for attorney’s fees and costs were incurred after April 8, 2004, they were rejected by the Court.
4 Furthermore, plaintiff’s request for attorney’s fees incurred in this action was rejected by the
5 Court in its September 13, 2007 order. See Dkt. #69 at 26 (Order Affirming Administrative
6 Decision) (“[B]ased on the Court’s ruling here, in this action plaintiff did not obtain any benefit
7 beyond what was obtained in the administrative proceeding. Accordingly, the Court finds that
8 while plaintiff is entitled to recover the portion of the fees he incurred at the administrative
9 hearing on issues where he prevailed, S.J. is not entitled to the fees incurred in this action.”).

10 In his motion, plaintiff has failed to identify any manifest error in these rulings or to
11 produce new facts or legal authority that would change the Court’s original analysis.
12 Accordingly, plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration (Dkt. #84) is DENIED.

13
14 DATED this 22nd day of January, 2008.

15
16 

17 Robert S. Lasnik
18 United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26